

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 remain pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to claims 1, 9, 16 and 17. The basis for the foregoing amendments may be found throughout the written description, drawings and claims as originally filed.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 9-13 and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schalk et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0154075). This rejection is respectfully traversed, particularly in view of the foregoing amendments to claims 1, 9, 16 and 17.

Schalk describes a method for analyzing a spoken alphanumeric string (e.g., a spoken sequence of digits in a credit card number). Schalk, however, does not teach or disclose that the user of the system (e.g., a caller) identifies the format for the identification sequence that is subsequently to be spoken from one of several predefined formats (see, FIG. 3, block 40 and paragraph [0048]) and then having spoken identification sequence analyzed according to the indicated format (see, FIG. 4, block 50 and paragraph [0049]). In particular, Schalk does not teach or disclose the step of "selecting, by the voice recognition system, one of said plurality of possible predefined identifier type formats, based on a format selection made by the caller using the connection," as now recited in claims 1 and 9.

Additionally, claims 1, 9, 16 and 17 require the format to be determined before the sequence is provided to the voice recognition system. In Schalk, however, the digital positional constraints, which the Examiner argues are a form of “identify type format”, are applied by the system after a spoken digit stream has been analyzed to generate a list of hypothesized digit streams, known as the “N-best list” (paragraphs [0016] and [0019]), and (FIG. 1, blocks 14 and 16). Finally, Schalk does not teach or disclose “receiving one of said plurality of possible predefined identifier type formats selected by a caller connected to the voice recognition system”, as claims 16 and 17 recite.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-6, 9-13 and 15-18, are patentable over the prior art and in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the foregoing rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schalk et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0154075) in view of Roberts et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,119,084). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 1-6, 9-13 and 15-18, Applicant submits that claim 7, which depends from claim 1, is patentable and in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the foregoing rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

B. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schalk et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0154075) in view of Elliot (U.S. Pat. No. 6,366,220). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 1-6, 9-13 and 15-18, Applicant submits that claim 8, which depends from claim 1, is patentable and in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the foregoing rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

C. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schalk et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0154075) in view of Layton et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,829,478). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons described above with respect to claims 1-6, 9-13 and 15-18, Applicant submits that claim 14, which depends from claim 9, is patentable and in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests, therefore, that the foregoing rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner

believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 19, 2008

By: /dpu/
David P. Utykowski
Reg. No. 39,052

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

DPU/src